

REMARKS

Claims 58-61 and 63-66 are pending in the present application, claim 62 and 67-82 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 58-61 and 63-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jusa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,219). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 58 recites a communication terminal comprising a first wireless communication section that receives, from other terminal within a distance for communicating with the communication terminal, information including a communication method for a second wireless communication section having a communication distance of which is longer than that of the first wireless communication section, said second wireless communication section that performs an authentication processing with the other terminal and establishes a communication session using the information received via the first wireless communication section when the authentication processing with the other terminal succeeds. Claim 63 recites a communication terminal comprising a first wireless communication section that transmits, to other terminal within a distance for communicating with the communication terminal, information including a communication method for a second wireless communication section having a communication distance which is longer than that of the first wireless communication section, and said second wireless communication, in response to a communication session establishment

request from the other terminal, performs an authentication processing with the other terminal and establishes a communication session using the information when the authentication processing with the other terminal succeeds. These claimed combinations are not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

As noted above, Applicant has amended the independent claims 58 and 63 in two ways.

First, the claims now recite that a communication distance of the second wireless communication section is longer than that of the first wireless communication section. Second, the claims now recite that the second wireless communication section performs an authentication processing with the other terminal, and when the authentication processing with the other terminal succeeds, it establishes a communication session.

The invention of Jusa et al. related to a technique of hand-over used in wireless LAN systems. In particular, Jusa involves a technique for maintaining active communication between a plurality of mobile communication units and base stations (access points) when a mobile communication unit moves from a cell, by switching (or changing) base stations. In Jusa et al., the mobile communication unit has a function to communicate with the wireless LAN but does not have other communication function (for example, the function corresponding to the second wireless communication section of the present invention).

The wireless LAN of Jusa et al. has a plurality of slots for performing data transfer and a plurality of communications can be established by using respective slots assigned by the base station, which may be recognized that a plurality of

communication functions are disclosed. However, the slots are not assigned to the communications between the mobile communications units but are assigned between the mobile communication units and the base station (see Fig. 8 of Jusa et al.).

Also, the feature of a communication distance of the second wireless communication section that is longer than that of the first wireless communication section is neither disclosed nor suggested in Jusa et al. Therefore, the present invention is not anticipated by the system disclosed in Jusa et al.

Applicant respectfully submits that a string citation of the same 7 places in the disclosure for both claimed elements in both independent claims (and for each of the dependent claims as well), does not constitute a complete explanation in detail the basis for the rejection. If this rejection is maintained, the Examiner is requested to particularly point out which specific elements in Jusa are alleged to correspond to the claimed elements, so that the Applicant can effectively respond to the Examiner's allegations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present invention, as recited in each of independent claims 58 and 63, as well as claims 59-61 and 64-66 dependent therefrom, is clearly allowable, and the Examiner is kindly requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of record and promptly pass this case to issuance.

If the Examiner has any questions, or if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions as to how to place this case in condition for allowance, he is kindly to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Appln. No. 09/831,830
Amdt. dated September 10, 2009
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /Ronni S. Jillions/

Ronni S. Jillions
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:ltm
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\K\KanfiTakayama\PTO\2009-09-10AMD.doc